UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/594,678	06/16/2000	David L. Dietz	06005/36797	1079

7590 11/06/2003

Marshall O'Toole Gerstein Murray & Borun
6300 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606

EXAMINER	
NORRIS, TREMAYNE M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2134	3

DATE MAILED: 11/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/594,678	DIETZ ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tremayne M. Norris	2134	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 June 2000* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *16 June 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2 .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-5,9-14,18-25,29-32 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chatterjee et al.

Regarding Claim 1, Chatterjee et al teach a process control system capable of executing a function after initiation thereof, the process control system comprising:

a computer having a memory and a processing unit; and

a security module stored in the memory of the computer (see col.5 lines 36-38) and adapted to be executed on the processing unit of the computer, wherein the security module analyzes security information collected contemporaneously with the initiation of the function and in association therewith to determine whether the function should be executed (Fig.1; col.5 lines 21-38).

Regarding Claim 2, Chatterjee et al teach a security system wherein the process control system comprises a network and the function is initiated via a device external to the network (Fig.1; col.4 lines 4-8; col.4 lines 17-34).

Regarding Claim 3, Chatterjee et al teach a security system wherein the device includes a client that generates a user interface to collect the security information (col.4 lines 4-16).

Regarding Claim 4, Chatterjee et al teach a security system wherein the client passes the security information in encrypted form to the security module (col.5 lines 7-13; col.5 lines 21-27; col.5 line 66 thru col.6 line 1).

Regarding Claim 5, Chatterjee et al teach a security system further comprising a process control application stored in the memory of the computer and adapted to be executed on the processing unit of the computer, wherein the process control application generates a security configuration interface for establishing a security parameter for the function executed by the process control system (col.5 line 43 thru col.6 line 1).

Regarding Claim 9, Chatterjee et al teach a security system wherein the process control system comprises a network and the computer resides at a node of the network (Figs.1 and 2).

Regarding Claim 10, Chatterjee et al teach a security system further comprising a process control application stored in the memory of the computer and adapted to be executed on the processing unit of the computer, wherein the process control application generates a user interface to collect the security information from the user (Figs.1 and 2; col.4 lines 4-16; col.5 lines 34-38).

Claims 11-14 are method claims that are substantially equivalent to security system claims 1-4 respectively. Therefore claims 11-14 are rejected by similar rationale.

Regarding Claim 18, Chatterjee et al teach a method of securing a process control system capable of execution of a function, the method comprising the steps of:

establishing a communication link between the process control system and a device external thereto to provide for remote initiation of the execution of the function (Figs.1 and 2; col.4 lines 17-19; col.5 lines 7-13);

generating a user interface via the communication link for collection of security information (col.4 lines 4-16);

determining whether the remote initiation of the execution of the function is authorized based on the collected security information (col.5 lines 21-33).

Claim 19 is a method claim that is substantially equivalent to security system claim 3. Therefore claim 19 is rejected by similar rationale.

Regarding Claim 20, Chatterjee et al teach a software system for a process control system capable of execution of a function, the software system comprising:

a computer-readable medium;

a first routine stored on the computer-readable medium that collects security information contemporaneously with the initiation of the function and in association therewith;

a second routine stored on the computer-readable medium that determines whether the execution of the function is authorized in accordance with the collected security information (col.4 lines 4-16; col.5 lines 21-33).

Regarding Claim 21, Chatterjee et al teach a software system wherein the first routine is executed in a client-server configuration such that the collected security information is transmitted from a client to a server (col.5 lines 7-13).

Regarding Claim 22, Chatterjee et al teach a software system wherein the security information is collected via a user interface at the client (col.4 lines 4-16).

Regarding Claim 23, Chatterjee et al teach a software system wherein the client is external to the process control system (col.3 lines 13-17; col.4 lines 17-27).

Regarding Claim 24, Chatterjee et al teach a software system comprising a third routine that encrypts the collected security information prior to transmission from the client to the server (col.5 lines 7-13; col.5 lines 21-27; col.5 line 66 thru col.6 line 1).

Claim 25 is a software system claim that is substantially equivalent to security system claim 5. Therefore claim 25 is rejected by similar rationale.

Claim 29 is a software system claim that is substantially equivalent to method claim 18. Therefore claim 29 is rejected by similar rationale.

Claims 30,31 are software system claims that are substantially equivalent to security system claim 3. Therefore claims 30,31 are rejected by similar rationale.

Claim 32 is a software system claim that is substantially equivalent to security system claim 4. Therefore claim 32 is rejected by similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 6-8,15-17,26-28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chatterjee et al as applied to claims 1,11,20 above, and further in view of Brezak et al.

Regarding Claims 6,16,26 Chatterjee et al disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 5), but do not teach that the security parameter comprises data representative of a lock associated with the function executed by the process control system. Brezak et al teach a security system wherein the security parameter comprises data representative of a lock associated with the function executed by the process control system (col.5 lines 45-67 to col.6 lines 1-3). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Brezak et al's system of user logon for network access to Chatterjee et al's workflow control system in order to improve the speed of a logon process in a network access control system (see Brezak et al col.1 lines 53-63).

Regarding Claims 7,15,27 Chatterjee et al disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 5), but do not teach that the security parameter comprises data representative of whether execution of the function requires the security information to include a user identification and password. Brezak et al teach a security system wherein the security parameter comprises data representative of whether execution of the function requires the security information to include a user identification and password (col.5 lines 45-67 to col.6 lines 1-3). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Brezak et al's system of user logon for network access to Chatterjee et al's workflow control system in order to improve the speed of a logon process in a network access control system (see Brezak et al col.1 lines 53-63).

Regarding Claims 8,17,28 Chatterjee et al disclose everything claimed as applied above (see claim 5), but do not teach that the security parameter comprises data representative of whether execution of the function requires the security information to include verification information. Brezak et al teach a security system wherein the security parameter comprises data representative of whether execution of the function requires the security information to include verification information (col.5 lines 45-67 to col.6 lines 1-3). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Brezak et al's system of user logon for network access to Chatterjee et al's workflow control system in order to improve the speed of a logon process in a network access control system (see Brezak et al col.1 lines 53-63).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tremayne M. Norris whose telephone number is (703) 305-8045. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM-5:00PM alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on (703) 305-4789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Tremayne M. Norris

October 31, 2003

Matthew B. Smithers
MATTHEW SMITHERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Art Unit 2134